



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE MASSACHUSETTS LAW OF LANDLORD AND TENANT. By Prescott F. Hall. Boston: George B. Reed. 1899. pp. xl. 534.

Landlord and Tenant Law in Massachusetts has a marked individuality and importance. The subject is relatively large, occasionally whimsical. For example, the doctrine of tenancies from year to year accepted in England and generally in the United States finds no favor in Massachusetts. *Ellis v. Paige*, 1 Pick. 43. And the related rule in *Curtis v. Galvin*, 1 Allen, 215, reminds one forcibly of the old technicalities—such as fines and recoveries. Here, then, is an excellent field for a purely local treatise,—and Mr. Hall's is strictly that. Speaking generally, the work is a valuable labor-saving tool for the working practitioner. As the author points out in his preface, he has endeavored to summarize so as to furnish a complete index to the decisions; to state the law as far as possible in the language of the court; to quote from opinions with sufficient fulness, so that a comparison with the original reports may often be dispensed with; to give not only the substantive law, but matters of pleading, practice and evidence. The value of such a book must necessarily depend on an exhaustive list of authorities, on skill in order and condensation. A brief examination of the author's citations reveals neither omissions nor errors of importance. The more leading cases appear in some half-dozen different places; notably, *Watriss v. Cambridge National Bank*, 124 Mass. 571, which holds that a tenant must remove his fixtures during his term or lose them, and the taking of a subsequent lease of the same premises will not entitle him to remove them during his second term. And the authorities are not entirely confined to Massachusetts. Where the growth of some doctrine is traceable historically to a leading case in a foreign jurisdiction, the author has indicated it. p. 108, *Dumpor's Case*, 40 Co. 119, b. The work is clear in its arrangement, admirable in its condensation, and will prove invaluable as a manual of ready reference. J. W.

THE LAW RELATING TO CHOSSES IN ACTION. By Walter R. Warren. London: Sweet and Maxwell. 1899. p. xxxxi, 456.

This book is practically the first attempt to deal with *choses in action* as a separate branch of the law. The subject, the author explains, is practically incapable of helpful definition; *choses in action* is merely a name descriptive of a great body of rights of various origin which have really no class characteristics. The plan of the book is, in brief, to find out what rights have been considered *choses in action* by the courts, and to examine each species of those rights in regard to its assignability at common law, in equity, or by statutes, with particular reference to the Judicature Act. Then the author takes up the methods of assignment of the various kinds of *choses in action*, both as to voluntary transfers and transfers by operation of law, and finally the English practice in regard to all these matters. The chapters dealing with assignments at common law and in equity seem especially valuable; the discussion of the doctrine of *Dearle v. Hill* is admirable. It is unfortunate that Mr. Warren saw fit to omit any discussion of gifts of *choses in action*—especially debts, specialty debts, and equitable obligations—and the right of a donor to recall them. The first are always revocable; the second, it seems, should be irrevocable, though no one can be sure what is the English law on the subject (see 12 HARVARD LAW REVIEW 498); the third are irrevocable. The distinctions are seldom understood.